

# Appendix 1 – Memorandum of Understanding

*MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING*  
*between*  
*Bureau of Land Management*  
*and*  
*State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources*  
*and*  
*Commissioners of Charles County, Maryland*  
*and*  
*The Conservation Fund*

*MOU # ES-930-01-02*

## **Introduction**

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Eastern States; the State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources (DNR); the Commissioners of Charles County, Maryland (Charles County); and The Conservation Fund establishes a framework for cooperation to facilitate acquisition of an area along the Potomac River in the State of Maryland known as Douglas Point for the enjoyment of future generations.

## **Background**

Douglas Point contains approximately 9 miles of unspoiled coastline along the Potomac River. Existing along this coastline is a major tributary to the Chesapeake Bay, Mattawoman Creek, a renowned Heritage Area at Malloys Bay, and the historic Port Tobacco River. This area, consisting primarily of wetlands and forest, is recognized as one of the most outstanding ecologically valuable areas in the Chesapeake Bay region, and has great potential as a heritage tourism destination. This natural coastline provides critical habitat for migratory waterfowl in the mid-Atlantic states, as well as for nesting Bald Eagles, Great Blue Herons, and numerous other rare and endangered plant and animal species.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this MOU is to document the commitment to continuing cooperation among BLM, acting on behalf of the DOI; The Conservation Fund, DNR; and Charles County to establish a cooperative working partnership involving Douglas Point. All parties agree to develop a) a Land and Natural Resources Protection Initiative; b) a Planning Analysis Document; and (c) an interagency Management Plan for Douglas Point.

a) Land and Natural Resources Protection Initiative: BLM and the DNR will jointly negotiate funding for a land protection initiative for the 5,500 acres. When necessary, assistance will be provided by The Conservation Fund or other non-profit, independent organizations. This effort is intended to result in the eventual ownership or protection of all or some of these lands for future public benefit, as well as to promote community economic development through heritage tourism opportunities; and

b) Planning Analysis Document: The BLM, with the support and assistance of the DNR, Charles County, and other organizations as needed, will assume a lead role in developing a Planning Analysis for Douglas Point. The Planning Analysis will be developed through consultation and coordination with the public and interested stakeholders. The document will address 1) options for management of the Douglas Point land; 2) criteria for evaluating options; 3) possible uses for the land; and 4) consideration of the area's natural, cultural, and recreational resources, including water access; and

c) Future Interagency Planning and Management: Through the Planning Analysis, the BLM, DNR, and Charles County will work cooperatively to define and identify specific proposed activities, interjurisdictional management responsibilities, funding needs and funding sources through the development of a Management Plan. It is understood that Charles County has primary interest in developing and promoting maritime heritage and eco-tourism opportunities at the Wilson property site, as well as in managing a new recreational public water access to the Potomac River at the site. Charles County envisions participation in certain targeted promotional, marketing, and operational aspects recommended in the Management Plan. The final management roles and details for all parties will be resolved and agreed to in the Management Plan.

### **Funding**

Nothing in the MOU shall obligate any party to expend, contract for or otherwise commit to payments of money. BLM's, DNR's, and Charles County's performance of its responsibilities under this MOU is subject to the availability of appropriated funds for land acquisition and/or future management of the site.

### **Conditions**

Upon mutual agreement, the parties recognize that each party may enter into similar agreement with other entities. The parties agree that this MOU does not constitute an endorsement of the other parties or their products, services, or opinions.

Any press release, articles, advertisements or other public statements that refer to BLM, DNR, or Charles County, or its respective employees or activities under this MOU, shall be developed in collaboration and mutually agreed upon by the parties before publication.

BLM, DNR, and Charles County are committed to providing recreational opportunities to peoples of all races, economic backgrounds, and physical abilities.

### **Scope and Limitations**

This MOU shall not be construed to grant, expand, create, or diminish any legally enforceable rights, benefits or trust responsibilities. The MOU does not preempt or modify any of DOI's, Charles County's, or the State of Maryland's statutory authorities.

### **Effective Date, Modification, Termination**

This MOU becomes effective when all parties have signed it.

This MOU may be modified by written agreement of all parties. Modifications may become effective immediately or at a give date as determined by the parties, if all parties agree to the modification.

Any party may suspend or terminate its own participation upon 60 days written notice to the other parties.

**Signatures**

STATE OF MARYLAND

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

/s/ Sarah J. Taylor-Rodgers  
Sarah J. Taylor-Rodgers, Secretary

Date: 12-13-00

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

/s/ Gayle F. Gordon

Gayle F. Gordon, Eastern States, State Director

Date: 12-13-00

COMMISSIONERS  
OF  
CHARLES  
COUNTY, MD

/s/ Murray D. Levy  
Murray D. Levy,  
President

Date: 11-01-00

THE CONSERVATION  
FUND

/s/ David M. Sutherland  
David M. Sutherland, Sr.  
Vice President

Real Estate

Date: 12-13-00

## Appendix 2 – Federal Paleontology Program Policy

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is charged with retaining the public lands in Federal ownership, planning for their future use through systematic inventory, protecting the quality of scientific and other values, and managing lands for multiple use and sustained yield. In carrying out this mission, the BLM manages fossil resources for their scientific, educational and recreational values in collaboration with museums and other groups. The great majority of the fossil record - invertebrates, plants and petrified wood - is available for the enjoyment of hobbyists, school groups and the general public. A permit is required for the collection of scientifically important fossils such as vertebrates, and such specimens and data must be placed in repositories where they remain the property of all Americans. The BLM supports the development of exhibits featuring federally associated collections, and the display of exhibit-quality specimens in local museums.

Because the BLM administers some 264 million acres of federally owned surface, detailed inventories to locate fossils are impractical except on a case-by-case basis. However, as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the BLM considers the impact to fossil resources when evaluating surface-disturbing projects such as pipelines or roads, and in the development of realty exchanges. The BLM maintains a professional staff of paleontologists who work with those from other land managing agencies to develop and provide training and to coordinate other interagency functions. Law enforcement officers in critical areas are available to work with paleontologists in preventing damage and loss of this resource.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fossils On Federal And Indian Lands, Report of the Secretary of the Interior May 2000 published at <http://www.doi.gov/fossil/fossilreport.htm>



## Appendix 3 – Geologic Time Scale

Table 1. Geologic Time Scale

GEOLOGIC TIME					
Eon	Era	Periods & systems	Epochs & series	Beginning of interval*	Biological forms
PHANEROZOIC	Cenozoic	<i>Quaternary</i>	Holocene	0.01	Earliest humans
			Pleistocene	1.6	
		<i>Tertiary</i>	Pliocene	5	
			Miocene	24	Earliest hominids
			Oligocene	37	
			Eocene	58	Earliest grasses
			Paleocene	65	Earliest large mammals
	Cretaceous-Tertiary boundary (65 million years ago): extinction of dinosaurs				
	Mesozoic	<i>Cretaceous</i>	Upper	98	
			Lower	144	Earliest flowering plants; dinosaurs in ascendance
		<i>Jurassic</i>		208	Earliest birds & mammals
		<i>Triassic</i>		245	Age of dinosaurs begins
	Paleozoic	<i>Permian</i>		286	
		<i>Carboniferous</i>			
		Pennsylvanian		320	Earliest reptiles
		Mississippian		360	Earliest winged insects
		<i>Devonian</i>		408	Earliest vascular plants (ferns & mosses)
		<i>Silurian</i>		438	Earliest land plants & insects
		<i>Ordovician</i>		505	Earliest corals
		<i>Cambrian</i>		570	Earliest fish
PROTEROZOIC	Precambrian			2500	Earliest colonial algae & soft-bodied invertebrates
ARCHEAN				4000	Life appears; earliest algae & primitive bacteria

\*In millions of years before the present





## Appendix 4 – Cultural Resources

This appendix describes the archaeological context of the cultural resources found in the planning area, as well as provides an overview of prehistoric and historic resources of the region.

### Archaeological Context and History of Investigations

#### Class I Overview and cultural resources management recommendations for the planning area

Previous archaeological and historical investigations within and around Douglas Point and the associated planning area have documented numerous historically significant archaeological sites and historical properties. This report discusses previous archaeological investigations (surveys) within the planning area, and outlines the current knowledge of known cultural resources sites and features located within the Area. One purpose of this overview is to provide a baseline description of known or suspected archaeological and historical properties existing within the planning area. This information will also be used to determine the potential for significant (unrecorded) historical properties located throughout the planning area and for further discussion of planned management activities within the tract. The direction of this narrative follows, in general, the Washington Office recommendations for Cultural Resources Considerations in Resource Management Plans.

The Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), Office of Preservation Services, graciously provided the archival and literature data consulted in this overview. The information is derived from the files and records maintained by the MHT, including cultural resource management (CRM) reports filed in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, and relative State of Maryland Statutes. Professional publications are also referenced, as appropriate. The Maryland Historical Trust will provide additional documentation relative to the management of submerged (underwater) historical features, such as those at Malloys Bay. The State of Maryland maintains ownership and preservation of submerged cultural resources within the Potomac River, and can better describe the historical integrity, and management of these resources.

Additional information relative to the identification and preservation of historic properties throughout Charles County can be found in the *Charles County Comprehensive Management Plan* (June 1997), as well as with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Southern Maryland Division. Another useful source of information is a rather comprehensive cultural resources overview of the U.S. Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, MD, by Goodwin and Associates, Inc. (1998). This report provides a synthesis of existing archaeological and historical properties within the naval station unit, and summarizes the cultural-history of the Lower Potomac River region.

## Previous Cultural Resources Investigations within the Douglas Point Tract

Few professionally guided cultural resources surveys have been conducted in/around the planning area. Within the broader planning area, the Douglas Point tract has been the focus of a few investigations – owing primarily to State-mandated compliance projects in advance of proposed mining or power development by Potomac Energy Power Company (PEPCO). Initial archaeological investigations within the Lower Potomac area were conducted by noted amateur archaeologist, and collector, R.G. Slattery in the 1930's (MHT: Widewater Quad File 4). Slattery notes collections taken from the extreme southern portion of tract, likely within the property currently owned/managed by the Maryland DNR, at Purse State Park. No specific references to the nature of these collections or the archaeological context is noted by Slattery, especially within the BLM, Douglas Point tract.

In 1973, PEPCO commissioned Dr. Charles McNett of American University to conduct a cultural resources survey of its Douglas Point holdings. The results of this survey are described in McNett and Hranicky (1973: MHT reference number 5-13/11). No sites and/or significant cultural features were identified during this inventory.

The McNett survey methods included meandering pedestrian reconnaissance along the exposed shoreline of the Potomac River and along various roadbeds and creek banks. Sporadic shovel testing was conducted, though the exact provenience, number and placement of individual Shovel Test Units (STU) is not reported. The field investigators also excavated 22 “major test pits,” which measured 5 feet square and 3 feet deep.” The major test pits were placed in “favorable” locations across the Douglas Point tract. A field sketch map of the major pits indicates they were concentrated within an area previously identified by a local amateur archaeologist/collector (Slattery), in the SE portion of the tract (Map included as Attachment...). Based on their survey, McNett et al. conclude the Douglas Point area is relatively void of significant archaeological materials, and “the possibility of any undiscovered remains appears very remote (McNett et al., 1973).”

*It is our (BLM) opinion that the McNett and Hranicky survey (1973) does not meet the professional standards for cultural resources inventory as outlined in the BLM Handbook and Manual (8100 series). The McNett survey also failed to record the obvious historic period site (18CH208) – the Mt. Pleasant/Chiles Homestead, which is visible on the surface today. In our opinion, the intensity of survey does not adequately cover the tract. Thus, this office does not accept their conclusion that the area is void of significant archaeological materials, based on the inadequacy of this survey.*

In 2001, a Phase I and II cultural resources inventory and evaluation was performed in a small portion of the Douglas Point tract by Joseph Hopkins Associates, Inc.. This inventory and evaluation was conducted in advance of a proposal by Maryland Rock to quarry sand and gravel within their landholdings at Douglas Point, and to construct a loading facility and boat landing along the shores of the Potomac River. Though the

proposed project was dropped by Maryland Rock Inc. upon the sale of the property to the BLM, the draft (final) report of archaeological investigations was filed with the MHT.

The Hopkins Associates (2001) survey considered an area of approximately 34 acres in their Phase I investigations, though the actual field inspection covered approximately 12 acres of the total project area. The field methods included excavation of 134 Shovel Test Pits (STPs) placed at 20-meter intervals across the upland landform – in the area proposed for direct impacts. Areas excluded from shovel testing include steep slopes, delineated wetlands and active streambeds. Individual shovel test units were excavated to sterile subsoil, and passed through a ¼” hardware mesh screen. According to Harris et al. (2001: 5), the STPs were excavated by natural strata to sterile subsoil, which varied in depth to approximately 30-50 cm below surface. The Phase I inventory indicated the presence of a sparse scatter of prehistoric lithic artifacts (n=11) across the project area. One hundred and fifty six (156) historic period artifacts were recovered within a confined locus within the project area. This area, subsequently referred to as the “Blue Banks Site,” (18CH696) was subjected to further (phase II) testing by Hopkins Associates.

*It is our opinion the Hopkins Associates, Inc. survey and evaluation of approximately twelve acres within the Douglas Point tract appear to meet Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, standards for archaeological inventory and evaluation.*

In 1974, J. Richard Rivoire of the Maryland Historical Trust conducted a comprehensive site report, line drawings and historical context for the Mt. Pleasant/Chiles House (18CH208). Rivoire’s 1974 report, titled: *Mt. Pleasant: A Representative Example of Eighteenth Century Domestic Architecture of the tidewater Maryland Region*, adequately documents the historical and architectural context of the Chiles House. Rivoire borrows from initial investigations conducted at the site by Dr. H. Chanlee Forman in 1956, published in his book titled: *Tidewater Maryland Architecture and Gardens*. Using Forman’s observations as a guide, Rivoire utilized field investigations, archival documentation and analysis of the structural debris, to reconstruct the structure from its beginning (circa 1780’s) to the time of its abandonment in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Rivoire encouraged PEPCO to consider having the Chiles House restored following documentation. He also encouraged further archaeological testing and interpretation at the site. Unfortunately, it appears that many of the structural features were removed by PEPCO following the completion of the 1974 report.

*It is our opinion that Rivoire’s report of the Chiles House meets professional standards and has possibly met the standards of the Historic Architectural Building Survey (HABS). Rivoire’s report is a valuable contribution to understanding this interesting historical property, and has documented the historical and architectural significance of this property. It bears mention that the site has not been nominated to the NRHP, thus its true archaeological and historical significance has not been formally evaluated relative to the NRHP criteria for historical significance, though the site (itself) is likely eligible for listing.*

Management Goals and Actions for Archaeological and Historic Properties (Sites)  
Identified within the Douglas Point Tract

Within the Douglas Point (BLM) tract, three archaeological and historical sites have been identified: Sites 18CH193, 18CH208 (the Mt. Pleasant/Chiles House) and 18CH696 – the “Blue Banks” site. Site 18CH193 is described, based on the meager information from the site form, as Unknown Prehistoric in age and cultural affiliation, while sites 18CH208 and 696 represent early American residential properties. Each site represents an unique record of historic land uses within the Douglas Point tract, and each requires additional testing to determine the level of historical and archaeological significance. The BLM adheres to the following management goals that pertain to all cultural and traditional properties located within the tract. With these goals in mind, each site is discussed individually, with specific management actions (recommendations) provided.

Pursuant to section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA; section 14(a)) and the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA; sections 103, 201, 202), the BLM’s goal is to preserve and manage significant cultural and traditional resources for present and future generations.

The BLM will ensure that all authorizations for land and resource use will comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, and will identify/protect significant historical properties in the best interest of the public.

*Site 18CH193*

Site 18CH193 was initially reported by Wilkes-Thompson in 1976 and a site form filed with the MHT in 1986. Very sparse information about this site is contained in the MHT files. The description indicates that the site consists of a single quartz chunk and flake atop a pebble beach. Shell fragments and possible fossils are noted. No other information is reported for this site location. The site has not been formally evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.

*Management Goals:* Management Goals cannot be yet be assigned to this site, until such time a distinct cultural property is recorded and evaluated.

*Management Recommendations:* Site 18CH193 should be revisited intensively surveyed and, if identifiable archaeological materials are recovered, subjected to further evaluation. Further evaluation will determine if the site has historical (archaeological) significance – relative to the NRHP, and potential for future research, public interpretation or some other resource management value.

Pending further evaluation, Site 18CH193 should be protected and preserved in place, until a formal site management plan is completed. All potential ground disturbing activities should be avoided within proximity to the site location. Routine monitoring of

the site should be conducted to ensure that archaeological and historical site integrity is not being compromised by human and/or natural disturbances.

*Site 18CH208, Mt. Pleasant/Chiles house*

The Mt. Pleasant/Chiles House is a thoroughly documented late 18<sup>th</sup> Century – early 20<sup>th</sup> Century historical site. Forman (1956), initially documented the architectural significance of the Chiles House in his publication – referenced above. Rivoire (1974) provides a comprehensive historical and architectural context for the Chiles House site.

In the “Introduction to the Architectural Analysis” in the report, Rivoire notes that the site was abandoned and decaying at the time of initial recordation by Forman in 1956. By 1972 the house was primarily in ruins, with only the two brick chimneys, two walls of the original structure and four partial walls of a later addition remaining upright. Upon completion of the architectural inventory (1974), most of the structural debris was removed from the site - with the exception of the brick chimneys, original structural foundation, and a portion of an early 19<sup>th</sup> Century addition on the main structure.

*Management Goals:* Site 18CH208 has been adequately recorded from an historical/Architectural perspective, though its’ overall significance – relative to NRHP listing has yet to be determined. While the architectural context may be lost, the site should be further evaluated to determine its archaeological integrity and context. The site may contain important archaeological data to help better understand early American settlement patterns in the Tidewater Region, as well as the lifeways of small-scale domestic residences within the region during the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Once evaluated, the Chiles House site may provide a unique opportunity for public interpretation through a variety of cultural heritage opportunities.

*Management Recommendations:* Pending further evaluation, Site 18CH208 should be protected and preserved in place, until a formal site management plan is completed. All potential ground disturbing activities should be avoided within proximity to the site location. Routine monitoring of the site should be conducted to ensure that archaeological and historical site integrity is not being compromised by human and/or natural disturbances. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) signage should also be posted around the perimeter of this site. This signage will clearly specify the criminal penalties for disturbing archaeological sites of Federal properties.

*Site 18CH696, the Blue Banks Site*

Joseph Hopkins Associates tested the Blue Banks Site in 2001, as part of the Phase I and Phase II survey. Phase II testing was performed in and around a concentration of red bricks, encompassing an area of approximately 422 square meters. Initial Phase II testing of this site indicates that the site dates from the mid 18<sup>th</sup> Century into the mid 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The initial investigations revealed the presence of a frame-style dwelling, with a brick chimney and floor. Additional domestic materials were also recovered, including: cut and hand wrought nails, diagnostic ceramic serveware (pearlware, redware,

whiteware), Kaolin pipe fragments, dark olive bottle sherds bricks, and iron. At the time of recordation, the site was physically intact, undisturbed, and covers approximately 3½ acres in areal extent.

*Management Goals:* The Blue Banks site should be further evaluated to determine its overall eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Further testing can provide a better understanding of early American settlement patterns and lifeways within the Tidewater Region. Small domestic occupations of this type are underrepresented in the archaeological record, thus additional information about these sites can lend important information to our understanding of early American history. Further evaluation of this site could also lead to interesting cultural heritage opportunities for public interpretation/education within BLM administered properties in the Douglas Point tract.

*Management Recommendations:* Pending further evaluation, Site 18CH208 should be protected and preserved in place, until a formal site management plan is completed. All potential ground disturbing activities should be avoided within proximity to the site location. Routine monitoring of the site should be conducted to ensure that archaeological and historical site integrity is not being compromised by human and/or natural disturbances.

Table 7. Douglas Point Archaeological Site Management Summary Table

<b>Site Number</b>	<b>NRHP Eligibility</b>	<b>BLM Management Goals</b>	<b>BLM Management Recommendations</b>	<b>Cultural Resources Use Allocation</b>
18CH193	Unevaluated	Protect and preserve in place - pending further evaluation	Conduct a Phase I survey  Further evaluation of significance, if site is discovered	Pending further evaluation.  Possible Scientific Use
18CH208	Unevaluated/ Potentially Eligible	Protect and preserve in place - pending further evaluation	Further evaluation (phase II)  Post Site Protection Signage (ARPA Signs)	Pending further evaluation –  Possible Scientific Use Possible public use (Interpretation)
18CH696	Unevaluated/ Potentially Eligible	Protect and preserve in place - pending further evaluation	Further evaluation (phase II)  Post Site Protection Signage (ARPA Signs)	Pending further evaluation  Possible Scientific Use Possible public use (Interpretation)

## Archaeological and Historical Sensitivity of the Lower Potomac River Planning Area

The archaeological and historical significance of the Lower Potomac River planning area is prevalent within the Douglas Point tract, as well as throughout the entire study area. To the immediate north of Douglas Point, in and around Mallows Bay (Wilson Farm), a tremendous variety of archaeological and historical features are extremely well represented. As documented by Shomette (1994, #199), Mallows Bay – and the associated Wilson Farm – contains a continuous record of extremely significant prehistoric archaeological sites, early American settlement sites, Civil War encampments and one of the most unique underwater shipwreck assemblages in the United States. The Maryland DNR, with assistance from the BLM, should consider nominating this location as a National Register Historic District or, possibly, a National Historic Landmark.

Significant archaeological and historical sites also exist throughout the entire planning area. Large prehistoric village sites are known to exist along the shores of the Potomac River as well as along several of the major tributaries of the Potomac within the planning area. As the entire planning area encompasses the shoreline and immediate uplands of the Potomac River, it is sufficient to state that the archaeological potential (sensitivity) for the entire area is extremely high.

Prehistoric Native American archaeological sites have also been documented within the interior portions of the planning area, particularly around wetland margins and streams. Other types of archaeological sites, including, 17<sup>th</sup> Century (Contact Era) sites, early American settlements (Colonial Era) as well as later historic period sites, can also be expected to occur throughout the planning area. Given the relatively undeveloped nature of the planning area, the Lower Potomac River contains tremendous potential to provide important information to help understand the prehistory and history of cultures throughout the entire Chesapeake Bay Region.

*Though very little professional archaeological survey and recordation has been conducted throughout the area, it is the opinion of the BLM that the entire planning area has a high potential for containing previously unrecorded archaeological and historical properties. Given the significant prehistoric occupations, as well as early historical events that have occurred throughout this region, the Lower Potomac River could be one of the most valuable areas for future archaeological research within the Chesapeake Bay region..*

*With such archaeological and historical intensity, the Lower Potomac River is ideally suited for developed, cultural heritage education (i.e. public interpretation). It is believed that the entire Planning Area, including Douglas Point, contains a continuous sequence of human habitation and resulting land use – from the earliest (Paleo-Indian) occupants in North America through the modern historic period. Thus, the Lower Potomac River region may possibly hold some of the most significant archaeological and historical properties yet to be discovered and interpreted.*

## Current and Future Possibilities for Cultural Resource Management

As previously discussed, the Lower Potomac planning area contains a tremendous variety of archaeological and historical resources. While several significant cultural resources sites have been identified and recorded in the planning area, countless others remain undiscovered. The goals for further management of cultural resources throughout the planning area include preservation and protection of known archaeological and historical sites until further evaluation is conducted. Such evaluation can help determine the significance of individual cultural properties, the potential for further scientific research as well as the potential for on-site interpretation and heritage education. Within those properties managed by the BLM, each cultural property will be assessed individually, and will be assigned to the one of the following:

### Cultural Resource Use Categories (from the BLM Manual 8110.42)

#### SCIENTIFIC USE

This category applies to any cultural property determined to be available for scientific or historical study using currently available research techniques, including methods that would result in the property's physical alteration or destruction. The category applies almost entirely to prehistoric and historic archaeological properties, where the method of use is generally archaeological excavation, controlled surface collection, and/or controlled recordation (data recovery). Recommendations to allocate individual properties to this use must be based on documentation of the kinds of data the property is thought to contain and the data's importance for pursuing specified research topics. Properties in this category need not be conserved in the face of a research or data recovery (mitigation) proposal that would make adequate and appropriate use of the property's research importance.

#### CONSERVATION FOR FUTURE USE

This category is reserved for any unusual cultural property, which, because of scarcity, a research potential that surpasses the current state of the art, singular historic importance, cultural importance, architectural interest, or comparable reasons, is not currently available for consideration as the subject of scientific or historical study that would result in its physical alteration. A cultural property included in this category is deemed worthy of segregation from all other land or resource uses, including cultural resource uses, that would threaten the maintenance of its present condition or setting, as pertinent, and will remain in this use category until specified provisions are met in the future.

#### TRADITIONAL USE

This category is to be applied to any cultural resource known to be perceived by a specified social and/or cultural group as important in maintaining the cultural identity, heritage, or well-being of the group. Cultural properties assigned to this category are to be managed in ways that recognize the importance ascribed to them and seek to accommodate their continuing traditional use.



#### PUBLIC USE

This category may be applied to any cultural property found to be appropriate for use as an interpretive exhibit in place, or for related educational and recreational uses by members of the general public. The category may also be applied to buildings suitable for continued use or adaptive use, for example as staff housing or administrative facilities at a visitor contact or interpretive site, or as shelter along a cross-country ski trail.

#### EXPERIMENTAL USE

This category may be applied to a cultural property judged well-suited for controlled experimental study, to be conducted by BLM or others concerned with the techniques of managing cultural properties, which would result in the property's alteration, possibly including loss of integrity and destruction of physical elements. Committing cultural properties or the data they contain to loss must be justified in terms of specific information that would be gained and how it would aid in the management of other cultural properties. Experimental study should aim toward understanding the kinds and rates of natural or human-caused deterioration, testing the effectiveness of protection measures, or developing new research or interpretation methods and similar kinds of practical management information. It should not be applied to cultural properties with strong research potential, traditional cultural importance, or good public use potential, if it would significantly diminish those uses.

#### DISCHARGED FROM MANAGEMENT

This category is assigned to cultural properties that have no remaining identifiable use. Most often these are prehistoric and historic archaeological properties, such as small surface scatters of artifacts or debris, whose limited research potential is effectively exhausted as soon as they have been documented. Also, more complex archaeological properties that have had their salient information collected and preserved through mitigation or research may be discharged from management, as should cultural properties destroyed by any natural event or human activity. Properties discharged from management remain in the inventory, but they are removed from further management attention and do not constrain other land uses. Particular classes of unrecorded cultural properties may be named and described in advance as dischargeable upon documentation, but specific cultural properties must be inspected in the field and recorded before they may be discharged from management.

